UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,576	03/30/2005	Tannichi Ando	040249-0103	7881

22428 7590 01/11/2011

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
CARTER, CANDICE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,576	ANDO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CANDICE D. CARTER	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 November 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-17,19 and 20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-17,19 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 March 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Following is a Final Office Action in response to communications received on November 16, 2010. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 20 have been amended. Claims 14 and 18 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 are pending and have been addressed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leymann et al. (6,826,579) in view of Saran et al. (2003/0055668).**

As per claim 1, and 12-13, Leymann discloses terminal device for designating business based on contents containing a layered system with an aggregate of said contents as the unit thereof and having the designation of said business described therein, comprising (col. 2, line 26-30 and claim 1 discloses a workflow management system in a computer system):

aggregate output control means for controlling the output of said aggregate based on an event response control program associated with said aggregate, which contains said contents being reproduced, among said event response control programs

having described therein a command for an event and associated with each of said aggregates, and in correspondence with said event (col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 50 discloses a process model consisting of activities, connectors, control flows, conditions, data structures, containers, etc, where the flow of control of the process determines the sequence in which activities of the process are executed by the evaluation of conditions, where a process model is an aggregate, where the results produced by the work represented by an activity are put into a data containers associated with an activity, and where an activity represents a business action that is performed);

contents reproduction control means for controlling the reproduction of said contents contained in said aggregate based on ordinal data associated with said aggregate, for which the output thereof has been designated with said aggregate output control means, among said ordinal data having described therein the reproduction order of said contents associated with each of said aggregates (col. 4, line 51-col. 5, line 42 discloses using connectors to define the sequence of activities and the transmission of data between activities in the process);

and transmission control means for controlling the transmission of the business condition information indicating the condition of said business to a contents provision device for providing said contents based on said event response control program associated with said aggregate containing said contents being reproduced, and in correspondence with said event (col. 6, line 14-34 discloses a trigger consisting of an event, condition, and an action, where event parameters are used to provide

parameters needed to evaluate the condition and pass data to the action, and where raising the event encompasses the provision of the data).

Leymann, however, fails to explicitly disclose a user input unit for receiving a user input based upon an action of a user, where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user.

Saran discloses a workflow engine for automating business processes having a user input unit for receiving a user input based upon an action of a user, where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user(¶ 144 discloses a GUI for defining a workflow, ¶ 145 discloses a GUI enabling an administrator to define which workflows will be used in response to a particular type of input event or incoming message; the user input unit [GUI] in this case allows the user to change the designation of a next action, by defining responses to input events, where the user is performing the action of defining, ¶ 43 also discloses modifying business rules).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the generation of ECA rules of Leymann to include a user input for receiving user input as taught by Saran in order to allow business rules and workflows to be controlled at an organizational level (see ¶ 145).

As per claim 2, Leymann discloses said business condition information contains at least either contents reproduction condition information indicating the reproduction of said contents, or acquisition condition information acquired internally or externally thereof (col. 4, line 51-col. 5, line 2 discloses connectors defining the transmission of data between activities according to the evaluation of conditions; see also col. 6, line 14-34).

As per claim 3, Leymann discloses wherein said acquisition condition information contains at least either event information indicating the acquired event, or sensor information acquired with a sensor (col. 5, line 17-29 and co. 6, line 30-34 discloses event parameters that are used to evaluate the condition and pass data to the action).

As per claim 5, Leymann discloses memory control means for controlling the memory of said business condition information (see col. 1, line 56-col. 2, line 3 and col. 10, line 38-col. 11, line 39).

As per claim 6, Leymann discloses, as best understood, wherein said aggregate output control means controls the output of said aggregate based on said event response control program associated with said aggregate containing said contents being reproduced, and said event response control program associated with said aggregate of the ancestor of said aggregate containing said contents being reproduced, and in correspondence with said event (col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 50 discloses a process model consisting of activities, connectors, control flows, conditions, data structures, containers, process activities, etc. where the flow of control of the process determines the sequence in which activities of the process are executed by the

evaluation of conditions, where the results produced by the work represented by an activity are put into a data containers associated with an activity, and where an activity represents a business action that is performed, where a process may be defined by a set of process activities, that are process themselves as disclosed in col. 5, line 56-65, and where in a process containing a set of linked process activities, and process activity will precede another process activity in the process model).

As per claim 7, Leymann discloses reproduction means for reproducing said contents based on the control of said contents reproduction control means and in correspondence with the type of said contents (col. 4, line 42-50 discloses data connectors transferring data from output containers to input containers by joining the output container with an input container and using the workflow manager to map data automatically).

As per claim 9, Leymann discloses second memory control means for controlling the memory of said contents, said event response control program, and said ordinal data (see at least col. 1, line 56-col. 2, line 3 and col. 10, line 38-col. 11, line 39).

As per claim 10, Leymann discloses transmission control means further controls the transmission of the request of said aggregate, for which the reception thereof has been designated from said aggregate output control means, to said contents provision device for providing said contents; and the terminal device further comprises: reception control means for controlling the reception of said contents belonging to said requested aggregate provided by said contents provision device, as well as said event response control program and said ordinal data associated with said requested aggregate (col. 6,

line 14-34, col. 7, line 35 and line and col. 9, line 44-col. 10, line 35 discloses a triggering system controlling the transmission of data between actions and activities, where the data belongs to the process model, where the triggers themselves are programs/rules).

As per claims 15-17, Leymann discloses a contents provision device, comprising:

memory control means for controlling the contents containing a layered system with an aggregate of said contents as the unit thereof and having the designation of said business described therein, and controlling the memory of an event response control program having described therein a command for an event to a terminal device for reproducing said contents associated with each of said aggregates, and ordinal data having described therein the order of reproducing said contents (col. 1, line 55-col. 2, line 13 and col. 10, line 38-col. 11, line 15 discloses a database management system controlling data for the process model and controlling triggers driving the process model);

transmission control means for controlling the transmission to said terminal device, when said aggregate is requested from said terminal device, of said contents belonging to said requested aggregate as well as said event response control program and said ordinal data associated with said requested aggregate (col. 6, line 14-34 discloses a trigger consisting of an event, condition, and an action, where event parameters are used to provide parameters to the workflow system needed to evaluate the condition and pass data to the action, and where raising the event encompasses the provision of the data);

and reception control means for controlling the reception of the business condition information indicating the condition of said business to be transmitted from said terminal device (col. 5, line 3-42 discloses evaluating the conditions of the process models in order to control the flow of control in a process model).

Leymann, however, fails to explicitly disclose where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user.

Saran discloses a workflow engine for automating business processes where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user (¶ 144 discloses a GUI for defining a workflow, ¶ 145 discloses a GUI enabling an administrator to define which workflows will be used in response to a particular type of input event or incoming message; the user input unit [GUI] in this case allows the user to change the designation of a next action, by defining responses to input events, where the user is performing the action of defining, ¶ 43 also discloses modifying business rules).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the generation of ECA rules of Leymann to include a user input for receiving user input as taught by Saran in order to allow business rules and workflows to be controlled at an organizational level (see ¶ 145)

As per claims 19 and 20, Leymann discloses a business management system constituted from a contents provision device for providing contents containing a layered system with an aggregate of said contents as the unit thereof and having the designation of said business described therein, and a terminal device for designating said business based on said contents;

wherein said contents provision device comprises:

memory control means for controlling the memory of said contents, and controlling the memory of an event response control program having described therein a command for an event to a terminal device and associated with each of said aggregates, and ordinal data having described therein the order of reproducing said contents (col. 1, line 55-col. 2, line 13 and col. 10, line 38-col. 11, line 15 discloses a database management system controlling data for the process model and controlling triggers driving the process model);

first transmission control means for controlling the transmission to said terminal device, when said aggregate is requested from said terminal device, of said contents belonging to said requested aggregate as well as said event response control program and said ordinal data associated with said requested aggregate (col. 4, line 35-col. 5, line 2 discloses connectors defining the sequence of activities and the transmission of data between activities);

wherein said terminal device comprises:

first reception control means for controlling the reception of said contents, said event response control program, and said ordinal data transmitted from said contents

provision device (col. 10, line 13-35 discloses the trigger system accessing data elements passed by an accessing means).

aggregate output control means for controlling the output of said aggregate based on said event response control program associated with said aggregate containing said contents being reproduced among said received event response control programs, and in correspondence with said event (col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 50 discloses a process model consisting of activities, connectors, control flows, conditions, data structures, containers, etc, where the flow of control of the process determines the sequence in which activities of the process are executed by the evaluation of conditions, where a process model is an aggregate, where the results produced by the work represented by an activity are put into a data containers associated with an activity, and where an activity represents a business action that is performed);

contents reproduction control means for controlling the reproduction of said contents contained in said aggregate based on said ordinal data associated with said aggregate, for which the output thereof has been designated with said aggregate output control means, among said received ordinal data (col. 4, line 51-col. 5, line 42 discloses using connectors to define the sequence of activities and the transmission of data between activities in the process);

second transmission control means for controlling the transmission of the business condition information indicating the condition of said business to said contents provision device based on said event response control program associated with said aggregate containing said contents being reproduced, and in correspondence with said

event (col. 6, line 14-34 discloses a trigger consisting of an event, condition, and an action, where event parameters are used to provide parameters needed to evaluate the condition and pass data to the action, and where raising the event encompasses the provision of the data);

and wherein said contents provision device further comprises:

second reception control means for controlling the reception of said business condition information to be transmitted from said terminal device (col. 5, line 3-42 discloses evaluating the conditions of the process models in order to control the flow of control in a process model).

Leymann, however, fails to explicitly disclose a user input unit for receiving a user input based upon an action of a user, where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user.

Saran discloses a workflow engine for automating business processes having a user input unit for receiving a user input based upon an action of a user, where a subject matter of said contents is changed according to an action of said user, and wherein a subject matter of said contents includes a designation of a next action of said user(¶ 144 discloses a GUI for defining a workflow, ¶ 145 discloses a GUI enabling an administrator to define which workflows will be used in response to a particular type of input event or incoming message; the user input unit [GUI] in this case allows the user to change the designation of a next action, by defining responses to input events, where

the user is performing the action of defining, ¶ 43 also discloses modifying business rules).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the generation of ECA rules of Leymann to include a user input for receiving user input as taught by Saran in order to allow business rules and workflows to be controlled at an organizational level (see ¶ 145)

4. Claims 4, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leymann in view of Saran and further in view of Jijina et al. (2004/0203696).

As per claim 4, Leymann discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose terminal device according to claim 1, further comprising a sensor for acquiring the sensor information contained in said business condition information.

Jijina discloses a method and system for vehicle data upload having a sensor for acquiring sensor information contained in business condition information (see ¶ 28 and 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the generation of event condition action rules of Leymann to include acquiring sensor information as taught by Jijina in order to facilitate the collection and transmission of data (see ¶ 30-33).

As per claim 8, Leymann discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose event generation means for acquiring the outside status and generating said event.

Jijina discloses an event generation means for acquiring the outside status and generating said event (¶ 33 and 34 discloses collecting vehicle status data and generating an event trigger).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Leymann to include acquiring outside status and generating an event as taught by Jijina in order to use status data as inputs into additional processes (see ¶ 33).

As per claim 11, Leymann discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose said aggregate output control means rewrites said ordinal data.

Jijina discloses rewriting data (see ¶ 38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Leymann to include rewriting data as taught by Jijina since the known technique of rewriting data would have predictably resulted in changing or update data as necessary. See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739].

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to arguments in reference to any depending claims that have not been individually addressed, all rejections made towards these dependent claims are maintained due to a lack of reply by the applicant in regards to distinctly and specifically pointing out the supposed errors in the examiner's prior office action (37 CFR 1.111). The Examiner asserts that the applicant only argues that the dependent claims should be allowable because the independent claims are unobvious and patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CANDICE D. CARTER whose telephone number is

(571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jamisue Plucinski can be reached on (571)272-6811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Jamisue A. Plucinski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629